

Questions posed in Fire Code Council meeting dated 10/18/05

1. How is a local municipality not able to accomplish their specific need for use of the International Fire Code (IFC) through local adoption? The stated goal of the Fire Code Council was to review and evaluate NFPA 1 UFC as the Fire Prevention Code for the State of Wisconsin.
2. How is the alternate adoption plan providing for a uniform fire prevention code throughout the state of Wisconsin?
3. Who will provide the training and the codebooks for the IFC option? The NFPA will be providing free codebooks and free training for all AHJs as part of the adoption.
4. Who within the Department of Commerce will be the 'expert' in answering questions arising out of the IFC? This question deals with areas not specifically related to construction i.e., fire alarms, sprinklers etc. If a user of the IFC has a question not related to the above will they need to direct that question to the ICC? Doesn't the ICC require a membership number to get code related questions answered?
5. Has the IFC been looked and reviewed to ensure that all the provisions within it are "no less" restrictive than those found in NFPA 1 UFC? There is already code text that states a municipality can adopt additional rules (codes) providing they are no less restrictive than the base document. Has analysis of the two documents been completed for consistency? If deficiencies have been or will be identified will there be references for deletion and cross-references made to the base document, NFPA 1 UFC? If so, haven't we set up a situation of using both documents? The same situation as if a municipality adopts the IFC by ordinance.
6. If the idea of alternate Code adoptions is something the state (Department of Commerce) embraces as a good and positive idea, shouldn't this extend to all the codes the state propagates? If code comparisons are not required for purposes of ensuring equity as it relates to safety and construction, why doesn't the Wisconsin Commercial Building Code offer a similar option for any municipality that would rather use the NFPA suite of codes? Is the Fire Code any less important than the other codes? If alternate adoptions in lieu of local ordinance is the rule (rule because we are codifying it), then shouldn't the same logic be applied to all or any code document(s) a municipality or enforcing agency may want to use?
7. The Department of Commerce has made clear during the Fire Code Council meetings that certain provisions of NFPA 1 UFC should be deleted because they **may** establish an unfunded mandate to the reader i.e. permits and certificates of fitness. Why did the Department of Commerce establish an unfunded mandate to the Fire Service when it adopted the IBC and related documents? The construction of a building is a cradle to grave venture. It is normally understood that the Building Inspector plays the dominant role during construction and the Fire Inspector has primary responsibility for the maintenance of all the life safety systems designed into the building. The unfunded mandate, who is providing the current building code, related documents and training in these documents to the Fire Service to ensure all the life safety features that were part of the original design are being maintained? The answer, **NO** one. There are very few departments that have found the available budget monies to pay for books and training. The Fire Service is a partner in the construction and ultimate maintenance of buildings. The books and training, prior to the enrolled ICC Suite were provided to all fire departments free. When will this unfunded mandate be addressed? When will the Fire Service receive the books and training it has asked for without sacrificing 2% dues or already overtaxed fire department budgets? When will this unfunded mandate be addressed?